REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for participating in the interviews, first on March 27 and then on June 18, 2007. The present claims and the prior art were discussed, but no agreement was reached. Applicants submit the following comments in response to the final office action dated April 19, 2007. Claims 1-20 are pending, of which claims 1, 14 and 18 are independent claims.

Claims 1-7, 8-10, 14-15 and 18-19 were rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 5,963,952 ("Smith"). Claim 13 was rejected under § 103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Smith in view of U.S. 5,367,619 ("Dipaolo"). Claims 11, 16, 17 and 20 were rejected under § 103(a) as being anticipated by Smith in view of U.S. 6,910,179 ("Pennell"). These rejections are traversed. Applicants submit that the present claims are patentable over the prior art of record, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the imposed rejections of the claims in view of the following remarks.

I. Smith Does Not Convert Between Different Panel Types

Claim 1 in its preamble recites a "method of *converting* a computer user interface panel between *different* panel types" (emphasis added). Moreover, the body of the claim recites "a first type of panels" and "a second type of panels" and also states that field attributes of the first panel type are converted to be compatible with the second type of panels. The other independent claims, 14 and 18, contain similar language and the discussion herein will focus only on claim 1.

Smith, in contrast, does not convert panels between different panel types. This is because Smith uses HTML-based documents to facilitate data entry from a client device 10 (Fig. 2) to a web server 22 (Fig. 2). The data entry can take place in either "connect mode", where there is an Internet connection between the devices, or "disconnect mode" where the client computer is offline and stores the data file locally. Smith 4:36-65. The data entry is made using a web page 31 that includes HTML tags. Smith 4:36-65. The web page that is loaded is referred to as the "primary document". Smith 5:50-52. Regarding the subsequent passing of the data from the client to the web server, Smith states that:

> The code generation state 76 ***is a function of the WEB page and is implemented in Java Script*** and located within the first logic area 41 of FIG. 3. During this state, a secondary document is opened. ***Document specific HTML tags and associated text are generated in the secondary document.*** An overall set of FORM tags are generated and entered into the secondary document. Included within the set of FORM tags are INPUT tags for text fields, radio buttons, and check boxes. Data entered into the primary document is extracted. The extracted data is entered into the secondary document as initial values for the INPUT tags.
>
> The code generation state 76 passes control to the display state 78 which ***presents the generated secondary document as a new WEB page*** in another window of a Browser having the menubar and toolbar before passing control back to the file state 80 for review. Smith 5:65—6:13 (emphasis added).

In short, Smith describes both the primary and secondary documents as web pages and they both contain HTML tags. Smith does not perform any conversion between panels of different panel types as required by the present claims. As such, Smith cannot be said to anticipate the present claims or render them unpatentable.

II. Smith Does Not Show the "Panel of the First Type" As Claimed

Regarding the first type of panels, the claim states that its configuration table "is tied to logic that specifies how the panel of the first type interacts with a backend of the computer system". Regarding the second type of panel, in contrast, the claim states that it "is formed of configuration table entries and is independent of the backend". The present specification mentions as an example that the first type of panel can be the "SAP dynpro" panel and that the second type of panel can be an HTML document suitable for display in a browser. Specification 3:15—4:19.

As was mentioned above, both Smith's primary and secondary documents are web pages and include HTML tags. Smith Figures 9-14. The final office action takes the position that the "load state 91" in Smith's Figure 5A presents a panel of the first type. Final office action page 12. However, Figure 5A in Smith and the accompanying description makes clear that the load state involves the primary document (see, e.g., step 94 in the load state 91 which states "present primary document in browser"). Smith 6:25-37. The primary document, in turn, includes HTML tags and is presented in a browser as a web page. Smith 6:28-30; 5:46-52. Thus, the load state 91 appears to only involve an HTML document (as does the subsequent code generation state that involves the secondary document).

In short, Smith does not show a type of panel that is "tied to logic" as required for the first type of panel in the present claims. Accordingly, Smith does not show a panel of the first type as required by the present claims. As such, Smith cannot be said to anticipate the present claims or render them unpatentable.

III. No Feature in Smith "Converts the Field Attributes" As Claimed

Finally, claim recites that an automated process converts field attributes "to be compatible with the second type of panels".

As has been mentioned, the operations disclosed in Smith are based on web pages that include HTML code. It follows from this that Smith need not, and in fact does not, convert any field attributes to be compatible with another type of panel. Nevertheless, the final office action states "that the HTML (data file) which stores the attributes for the second and first panel, has the ability and function to modify and edit the attributes that well (sic) known in the art". Final office action page 13. However, this statement ignores the fact that the panels in Smith are web pages with HTML tags, so different types of panels are not involved and conversion is therefore not performed. Moreover, Applicants strongly disagree with the suggestion that it is well known in the art to convert field attributes of the first type of panel, as defined in the present claims, to be compatible with the second type of panel as defined in the present claims. For sure, Smith contains no evidence of such conversion, and no other support has been cited in support of the position taken in the final office action.

In short, Smith does not show a conversion of field attributes as required by the present claims. As such, Smith cannot be said to anticipate the present claims or render them unpatentable.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the present claims are patentable over the prior art of record.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/19/07

J. Richard Soderberg
Reg. No. 43,352

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696